

SRs Workgroup Meeting Notes  
May 5, 2021

- A. SR Workgroup Principles
- B. Specific SR Section to Review
- C. Next Steps
- D. Known Pinch Points

**A. SR Workgroup Principles**

- The SRs must be easily accessible, simple to understand, and applicable for everyday use.
- The SRs must broadly declare and describe Senate’s authority.
  - The SRs should continue to describe approval processes for common types of proposals.
  - The SRs should clearly state that queries about approval processes for other types of initiatives/ideas/changes must be directed to the Senate Council office or SC chair for guidance on the appropriate proposal format and Senate review process.
  - Continue to provide [detailed curricular proposal help](#) on Senate’s website.
- *Senate Rules Section 9* (“Glossary of Terms”) should be expanded with more terms, to ensure clarity throughout the SRs.
- Develop and utilize a style guide to help the SRs remain clear over time and provide guidance to those proposing changes. For example:
  - Use a defined term from *Section 9* if one exists.
  - Use active voice. Ensure it is clear who will be do an action.
  - Use terminology that is blind to technological changes and position titles.
- The SREC should, as needed, modify Senate-approved SR language so that the sentiment approved by the Senate is promulgated throughout the SRs. This sentiment is congruent with existing language in *SR 1.4.2.1* (“Senate’s Rules and Elections Committee (SREC)).
  - To ensure Senate’s intent is codified throughout the SRs, the SREC should feel empowered to modify other SR sections involving the same topic, including ensuring adherence to a style guide and use of defined glossary terms.
  - To ensure the SREC’s codification matches the Senate’s intent, the SREC should also be obligated to provide an annual report to Senate on “complex” SR updates that affect more than the specific language changed by Senate vote.

SRs Workgroup Meeting Notes  
May 5, 2021

**B. Section to Review: SR Section 3 (“Programs, Courses, and Curriculum Procedures”)**

*Note: Primary focus is on Section 3.3 (“Creation, Consolidation, Transfer, Closure, Abolition, or Significant Reduction of Academic Programs and Educational Units”).*

- Change the reference in SR 3.3 from “significant reduction” to “significant change or reduction.”
- Ensure that the curricular approval processes outlined in *Section 3.3* are reflected in the charges to Senate committees and academic councils in *Section 1* (and vice versa).
- Be deliberate about including SR language that describes the rights and responsibilities of unit faculty and college faculty councils in the curricular review process.
  - Similar to existing curricular proposal help on Senate’s website, develop guidance for faculty seeking information about their unit-level rights and responsibilities.
- Clarify curricular approval steps for professional courses and professional programs.
- Improve how the SRs establish Senate oversight of noncredit-bearing education.

**Next Steps for SR Workgroup**

1. Develop and review types of recently received proposals and how the SRs inform (or do not inform) each type of proposal (format of proposal, approval process steps, etc.).
2. Solicit suggestions from members of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) regarding terms that should be formally defined and added to the “Glossary of Terms” in *Section 9*.
3. Provide update to Senate Council and ask for input on Workgroup’s overall direction/effort thus far.
4. Reconvene after SC discussion and review comments.

**Known Pinch Points**

- There are places where the SRs do not reflect current practice.
- How do SRs address *managerial* decisions regarding personnel and resources that affect the attainment of educational objectives (GR IV.C)?
- What is the best position for the SREC in the curricular review process when proposals include SR changes – before final approval or afterwards?